

**MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
PARK BOARD
HELD AT SHERWOOD ROOM, EDINA SENIOR CENTER
January 8, 2013
7:00 PM**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Steel called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

II. ROLL CALL

Answering roll call were Members Almog, Gieseke, Segreto, Jacobson, Dan Peterson, Deeds, Jones, Steel

Member Cella arrived at 7:07 pm

New Parks and Recreation Assistant Director

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board that Susan Faus has been promoted to the Assistant Director position of the Parks and Recreation Department and will officially start her new position on January 14th. She introduced Susan and noted that she will be doing double and triple duty for a little while until they get her position replaced as the General Manager of Edinborough Park and the Edina Aquatic Center. Ms. Faus gave the Park Board a little bit of her history. Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board she is going to be shuffling duties a little bit compared to the way they have been. She indicated that she is going to maintain overall supervision of the enterprise operations but will be asking for Ms. Faus' help on a variety of different issues especially in terms of how they can work better together as enterprise operations for cost saving measures, technology, social media, marketing, etc. She added that Ms. Faus will be supervising the recreation supervisors and provide them a lot of support to continue to improve programming opportunities.

III. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

Member Segreto made a motion, seconded by Member Dan Peterson, approving the meeting agenda.

Ayes: Members Gieseke, Segreto, Cella, Jacobson, Dan Peterson, Deeds, Jones, Steel

Motion Carried

IV. ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA

Member Dan Peterson made a motion, seconded by Member Segreto, approving the consent agenda as follows:

IV.A. Approval of Minutes – Regular Park Board Meeting of Tuesday, December 11, 2012

Ayes: Ayes: Members Gieseke, Segreto, Cella, Jacobson, Dan Peterson, Deeds, Jones, Steel

Motion Carried

V. COMMUNITY COMMENT

None

VI. REPORTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

VI.A. Do.Town Presentation

Sara Maaske, Field Director for Do.Town, gave the Park Board an update on the Do.Town projects that are being done in Edina.

Member Segreto asked what is their funding cycle and how long are they funded through. Ms. Maaske replied they are funded as a staff through the end of March and so they will be doing several things as they transition into the next three months. She indicated they are doing a telephone “Town Hall” with the Mayor which is coming up on January 16th where they will be talking about creating healthier communities. She noted they will also give the audience an opportunity to talk to the Mayor about what they would like to see as well as things that may have happened already in their neighborhoods. She stated from there they are going to be working with the residents they have worked with over the last 12 to 18 months on transitioning and working to put forward the things that they have been working with them in the community. Member Segreto asked about continuity; will there be any involvement of staff or the city with the transition so they have a sense of follow through on all of the projects? Ms. Maaske replied absolutely and that is a key component, not only are they going to be doing some leadership training with residents but they will also be doing some leadership conversations with the City whether it’s the City Council, boards and commissions or City staff because they want to make sure that it is integrated and folks are working together.

Member Jones asked Ms. Maaske if Do.Town went through all of these projects with the City Council before they began working on them. Ms. Maaske replied not necessarily but that a lot of the projects they chose to work on were based on resident input. She explained when they first started on the campaign their job was to go out and talk to residents and find out what they would like to see in their community to create a healthier community. She noted it was from those conversations that they developed the different types of things they are working on but that they did communicate with the City Council at all points throughout the conversation. Member Jones commented that as a Park Board member she is confused that she wouldn’t know, for example, there was a community garden being proposed at Yorktown Park even though they were talking about what would be on their work plan for the coming year. She stated she did not know there was a petition that Do.Town had started regarding this and had no idea this was going to be on their plate and wondered how that happened. Ms. Masske replied again that it was resident driven and it would be the same as if any neighborhood came forward and asked you to look at X, Y and Z because they would like to make improvements. They were just helping those residents gather the people together.

Chair Steel indicated that Do.Town has done a lot of grass roots work that the Park Board has not done because it requires a lot of effort, funding and time; therefore, as they are starting their strategic planning process she would like to ensure that they take any information Do.Town has collected so they can include that in their priorities. Ms. Maaske replied absolutely and noted they have gathered a data base of approximately 3,000 people to which approximately 700 of those individuals are Edina residents. She noted those individuals expressed interest in specific things which is all in their database and when they are no longer necessarily here physically it will be the city’s database going forward.

Member Segreto stated they have done a great job of getting the name “Do.Town” out and thinks a lot of their residents do understand what Do.Town is and asked is it a trade name or the name of a non-profit because it would be a shame going forward if that disappears. Ms. Maaske replied she doesn’t have a definitive answer on that; however, she knows that Blue Cross Blue Shield are the ones who own the “Do.Town” but thinks they probably do want to carry it forward if at all possible. Member Segreto asked Ms. Kattreh if she sees any value in that to which she replied she does and they have had that discussion as well so hopefully they can work it out with Blue Cross to move ahead.

Chair Steel asked what has happened in other communities like Albert Lea. Ms. Maaske responded what happened in Albert Lea was that they carried forward with a non-profit organization, so that is one model that could potentially do and one of the things that they were trying to do very differently from what Albert Lea did was that they didn’t really do a good job of engaging their residents around

this. They were more focused on getting the changes done at the City level and so when they left they didn't really have a group of residents who were committed to these policies and these systems or environmental changes that were happening in the community so they had to rebuild. They did end up going like she said with a non-profit model in order to do that and she would assume that might be a potential option she knows it is something that Mayor Hovland has been expressing interest in.

Member Jones indicated that she is on the Bike Edina Task Force and she doesn't remember a representative from Do.Town talking to them about the safe routes to school. Ms. Maaske replied that was led primarily by Bloomington Public Health and the consultant that was hired for that project came in with all of the contacts available to them and it's been their job to be engaging with the residents and folks in the City. She stated that frankly she doesn't think they have been doing a very good job and that consultant firm will be building the plan for both Richfield and Edina. Ms. Maaske stated that what they have expressed to the consultant firm is they don't think they have enough engagement within the community to build an appropriate plan but she does know they have Bike Edina Task Force as one of the contacts and that she does know that Katie Meyers had conversations with Bike Edina Task Force about safe routes to school. Chair Steel stated any way they can improve communication in the next couple of months would be great and also asked Ms. Maaske that if she has any updates that she thinks the Park Board might find interesting to send it to Ms. Kattreh.

Member Cella asked Ms. Maaske to also keep the School District in the loop because she also feels there have been times when Do.Town has been working on issues central to the schools but nobody contacts the School District and the only reason they hear about it is because it is out in the community. She indicated that she understands your focus is community organization but when it's things that impact the schools it's the School District that makes the policies and get it done and if they are not at the table it's not going to happen. Member Jones commented she feels in a similar way about what has happened to the Park Board on a couple of issues because there are now new issues that they have never discussed and are not part of their work plan. She asked why it wasn't brought forward so that they could work collaboratively on it. Ms. Maaske replied she knows their campaign manager, Alex, did meet with Chair Steel several months ago, but knows they have not come to the group as a whole. She stated it is a pilot project and that they have learned they need to loop in the boards and commissions at an earlier date because they learned a little too late down the line that the boards and commissions have a key role in this as well. Member Jones replied it's not just the boards but staff as well. She indicated these are really good ideas but folding them into a work plan so that it doesn't burden staff has really been an issue with the City on many things. She stated there are a lot of needs that they can all see that could improve Edina; however, what fits best and what they are currently working on could really use your help but feels it is not as coordinated as it could be. Ms. Maaske replied she feels like they have met a lot with City staff over the course of the Do.Town project and communicated about different things and believes they did talk about community gardens early on and if they didn't do it often enough or pointedly enough it is definitely something that they know they need to wrap into.

Chair Steel clarified to the Park Board that this isn't on Ms. Maaske personally but that she did request a meeting with Alex in August or September to ask that the Park Board get wrapped in the process and that someone come and present before the Park Board. She noted that she didn't get a request to appear before the Park Board until their November meeting so it was quite frustrating. She indicated that she did hear what was going on and she wanted everyone to be collaborative; it's great work, you are doing great things and there is a lot of information. Ms. Maaske replied point well taken and she apologized if that didn't happen soon enough. Member Segreto stated on a go forward basis during the transition period let's both make an effort to work hand in hand to which Ms. Maaske replied absolutely.

Member Jacobson asked if there is a larger intent to maybe tie the community garden along with the garden they discussed having at Lewis Park and do the whole thing at one time. Ms. Kattreh replied they want to look at both of these community garden projects as pilot programs. She would like to see how they go, have Park Board assess how it's working and costs associated with it, any problems or positive outcomes, all sorts of things and so they definitely want to grow the garden slowly. Member Jacobson asked so this year could be kind of a learning opportunity and then from that we will hopefully make a big plan for the next summer to which Ms. Kattreh replied absolutely.

Ms. Maaske commented that hopefully they will improve communications over the next three months and be able to work together in the transition.

VI.B. Community Garden Committee for Yorktown Park

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board that in the packet she tried to give the history of how they've come to this point with the community gardens. She indicated that Do.Town has done a really nice job of gathering community support for this project and other board and commission support for this project as well. Ms. Kattreh noted that from staff's perspective she thinks it's pretty safe to say that they were brought into this at the end of November and they do support this pilot project; however, as Member Jones pointed out Park Board was also brought in late to the project. She stated if they have support from the Park Board to pursue this pilot project at Yorktown Park, what they would be looking for tonight is interested members who would be willing to serve on the committee. She added that the goal for the project is to have it operational this summer which means they have a lot of work to do in a little bit of time. The hope is to put together a group of Park Board members, Energy and Environment commission members, Garden Council members, and Community Health Commission members as well as interested residents, Do.Town and the YMCA.

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board they need to select a location and write some policies such as what you would like to see in terms of a goal for the project, do you want specific plots that are for seniors or specific plots that may be available for neighboring partners. She stated that she knows the YMCA is very interested in a specific plot and how they would want the garden to look. Ms. Kattreh commented gardens in different communities have different looks and some are better than others. She noted that what she thinks she heard loud and clear from the group that gathered at the YMCA in December is if it's going to be in an Edina park they want it to be a good representation of an Edina park and want to make sure that the quality is there. For example, they are not going to allow individual plot leasers to put up their own fencing but rather they would put up a nice attractive fence and make sure it is done the right way.

Member Jones asked what the timeline is for this working group and is it this working group's mission to create the policy for that park to which Ms. Kattreh replied correct. Member Jones asked has it already been decided that there will be a park or is the working group going to recommend whether or not there should be a pilot project for a community garden and if yes then they would come up with a policy for the garden. Ms. Kattreh responded she thinks it's safe to say yes as well as have some good conversations and that they have buy-in from the Park Board as to whether or not you feel this is a good idea. She stated that there is a fair amount of support on the City Council for this project to at least do it in a pilot fashion for the first year; however, if they do not have the support of the Park Board to do the project it is important that that be known.

Member Segreto asked what issues need to be considered in light of staff time to which Ms. Kattreh replied the Parks and Recreation Department will probably be the ones administering the project so that would be leasing the plots. In addition, it would probably be parks maintenance staff that would

be responsible for doing the tilling at the end of the year as well as probably help with the construction of the project. She noted that could be everything from the beds, possibly raised beds, to importing soils to maybe even fencing. Ms. Kattreh pointed out there is also the complaint and issue side of community gardens that can happen which can be pretty intensive from what they've heard from their neighboring communities.

Member Dan Peterson commented the Edina is the only community in the western suburbs that doesn't have a community garden and we need it. He indicated that there are probably two or three community gardens in the area that will have all of the rules that we need that work and maybe we could take those and adopt them.

Ms. Kattreh indicated that from a financial standpoint she thinks they have some partnership opportunities with the YMCA.

Member Dan Peterson stated that he thinks there are a lot of master gardeners who would love to be asked to give talks to kids or seniors for e.g., if you want tomatoes this is how to do it, etc. Ms. Maaske commented that Whole Foods has actually expressed interest in this project as well as they offer community grants. She indicated that another group that could be potentially tapped into would be the Eagle Scouts, they could build raised beds, etc. Someone commented that it could be a May Term project as well.

Member Jones noted that what she is hearing from this discussion is that the Park Board is in favor of pursuing this as a pilot project, which she agrees it's a good idea; however, it is changing the use of a park. She asked to make note that this is not land that is just not being used because it is being used right now as open space and they need to discuss how they make those decisions. In addition, how are they informing the neighbors of the decision?

Member Deeds asked Ms. Kattreh to go through Attachment C where they are talking about placing the Community Garden. Ms. Kattreh pointed out the area as well as discussed as a pilot project they would maybe like to have one of the large water containers brought to the site and if they did that would they be able to utilize the YMCA parking lot to bring their water truck right up to it. She noted the YMCA would provide parking to that site and would also provide the restrooms which is a nice amenity because most community gardens have port-a-potties.

Chair Steel stated the action request is to select a few Park Board members to serve to provide recommendations on a pilot project which includes location, costs, partnership opportunities, policy and then the committee will provide a recommendation to the Park Board. She added there are going to be members from other boards and commissions on the committee. It was asked if other boards and commissions are going to have input as a whole or are they acting through their committee liaison. Ms. Kattreh replied that the Community Health Committee has been the most active in the community garden project to date and has had conversations with Scott Neal, City Manager, as to their exact involvement. She noted as Member Jones pointed out they are using Park property and therefore she personally thinks that it should be a Park Board recommendation to utilize this space as well as adopt a policy for this program. Chair Steel asked about the time commitment for this working group to which Ms. Kattreh replied she may be unrealistic but she would like to think they could achieve their goal in two meetings.

Member Dan Peterson indicated if it's in the middle afternoon or later he would be happy to serve. Member Jones indicated she could also serve.

Member Deeds made a motion, seconded by Member Segreto, to approve and support a community garden at Yorktown Park.

Ayes: Members Gieseke, Segreto, Cella, Jacobson, Dan Peterson, Deeds, Jones, Steel

Motion Carried

Member Jones made a motion, seconded by Member Segreto, that Member Dan Peterson be the Chair of the working group and that she serve.

Ayes: Members Gieseke, Segreto, Cella, Jacobson, Dan Peterson, Deeds, Jones, Steel

Motion Carried

Ms. Maaske commented that as she understands residents who are not currently serving on a commission or board can participate to which Ms. Kattreh replied yes. Ms. Maaske noted that she will make sure that the folks that were at the meeting know.

VI.C. 2013 Park Board Work Plan

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board the work plan they are looking at is what was approved by the City Council with very few changes to the plan that the Park Board adopted. She noted in terms of priority there are two areas that the Park Board should focus on first; the strategic plan and the community gardens because they are trying to get those up and operational by this spring or summer.

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board that the City Council has allocated \$60,000 to the Park Board to complete the study to which she has taken the liberty to contact one vendor to give the Park Board an idea on what they should be able to expect based on the description the Park Board has put together for the work plan. Ms. Kattreh passed around a couple of examples from two other cities: Coon Rapids and Hastings. She explained that it addressed needs assessment using focus groups, park and open space plans, trail system plans, ecological restoration plans or just ecological plans recreation, program plans including multiple providers in a community, operations and maintenance plans and then implementation plans. She indicated they would go through and take a look at individual parks and individual enterprises in our system based on what the Park Board feels are the areas of priorities. They would look at the parks and facilities and give us an idea of utilization or recommendations for improvements to parks and then they would put priorities and even dollar amounts associated with those. She stated that she thinks it would give the Park Board a really good planning tool for changes to parks, changes to programming and budget allocations.

Member Jacobson asked if they currently have a master plan for every park to which Ms. Kattreh replied for every park they do not. She explained that the parks previously referenced do have master plans because they have done or are going to be doing some major renovations. She explained that it would not be to the extent of what they have done to Countryside Park nor do they want it to be to that extent because things can change and that gives them the ability for input. They need to find out if they are utilizing the parks well or tell us here are some ideas that we could do differently to improve our parks.

Member Deeds commented that is down low and in the weeds before there is an actual discussion and thought process on what should the park system look like in 2025 and in 2040 in Edina and how do we overcome the disadvantages of the small distributed park system that we have. He pointed out there is a big picture and there are questions that need to be answered before any of that does. Member Deeds indicated that he does this for a living and what happens is they go on a shelf and they are absolutely worthless and it's a waste of \$60,000. He stated if it's not a living, breathing document it becomes a failure because you go down in the weeds before it developed a vision of what's going to happen; it's not about having individual park plans, it's about what is the vision for Edina Parks &

Recreation for 2025 and 2040 and how are we going to get there and what does that mean. He noted they have an infrastructure right now and it may not be the right one and so the first question is what is it that the City should be striving to be and be striving towards in its parks system. He stated that he doesn't think it's ever actually been thought through. He thinks there is not that level of vision or thought process that has gone into it. He added that it's very incoherent and very inconsistent; they have stuff going on here and a little stuff going on here and some stuff drops in over here, etc.

Member Cella commented that she agrees with Member Deeds. It's crisis management. Whatever new great idea for one area comes up they deal with that. She stated they are still not solving the over-arching strategic focus of what it is we want our parks and recreation to do in Edina. Member Segreto stated that vision is not going to be fabricated by the person writing the plan to which Member Deeds replied no, absolutely not.

Member Deeds explained that the first stage of assessment is essentially a competitive assessment because we compete with surrounding cities and in the park system right now they are at a disadvantage if you compare what they have relative to the next ring out like Eden Prairie, Minnetonka and Wayzata because they have larger, newer facilities. Therefore, there is a level of assessment that they need to do and then figure out what we want. However, before they get to this level of planning the City Council has to get on board and say "yes", that's a vision we are going to work towards because these are big decisions and they are very expensive decisions.

Member Jacobson commented that it sounds like a two-phase project, first you have a consultant who does a community assessment or a needs assessment. Member Deeds replied they already have some of that but there is a level of just a very basic competitive position, competitive assessment that needs to be done simply beyond what the citizens want because if they want to stay thriving they need to continue to attract people in. He noted they are an inner ring older suburb and they need to figure out a way to maintain a competitive position and be a desirable location for people to relocate to.

Chair Steel noted that she thinks Member Deeds is hitting at all of the right points and she definitely wants it to be a document that is used and very practical; however, this is going to be a giant priority going forward. She proposed for the next meeting the Park Board members submit ideas to Ms. Kattreh with questions you want answered and things you want to look at because they need time to think about that and they are not going to come up with the right components now. She noted that Ms. Kattreh will put all of the information she receives together and maybe highlight the things that she thinks would work well and then continue the discussion in much more detail at the next Park Board meeting.

Member Cella commented that in looking briefly at the two examples passed around it looks like the most useful things would be their vision and policy plans which are the first five pages. It looks like that is where they received input from community groups, users, the school district, etc. and then put together a vision where they have their park vision, their open space vision, their trail vision, etc. There is a vision for everything and they have some goals and objectives and some rules of the road of how they are going to get there. Member Deeds commented that those are where the value is because of those kinds of decisions. He indicated the world changes by the minute and when the rest of it begins running into reality the question is making decisions based on the vision and we don't have a vision.

Chair Steel asked the Park Board if it would be helpful at the next meeting to provide some City wide contents of visions. Member Deeds replied as well as demographic projections, because one of the things that is kind of unique about this challenge is the timing is so much longer than most because

when dealing with corporations you plan maybe five or seven years of the outside maybe a little longer. However, when you talk about parks and infrastructure like this it's a substantially longer planning process because it doesn't change quickly. Member Cella commented that it's very similar to what they are doing at the school district because they are in a community where people expect a certain amount of excellence but your infrastructure is old and aging and not in the shape that the other suburbs are but everyone expects that. She stated they are head and shoulders above everybody else but yet you don't have the same facilities and so how do you make that work. Member Deeds commented and how do you bring those facilities up so that they present the image that you want as a community. He pointed out that it's critical to somebody coming in and out of town and they need to make an offer on a house within 72 hours and will probably choose from all three communities and drive through and some of the parks look a little run down.

Chair Steel commented that she is so thankful that the City Council gave them a little money to work with and she thinks this is really key to their work.

Ms. Kattreh stated what Member Deeds expressed is exactly what she feels is important as well, we don't want the Park Board to get caught up in the minutia of a swing set at a park; it's the bigger picture vision and it needs to be a working document and a blueprint for the future of our park system. She stated that she looks forward to receiving Park Board's input and at that point they would put together a request for qualifications for potential consultants.

Member Segreto asked what does this note on the bottom of the page from the City Council really mean that states "the City Council would like to focus on parks strategic plan during 2013 and has altered goals related to the Senior Center and Wooddale Park to reflect this focus". Ms. Kattreh replied it means they would really like us to focus on the strategic plan and not make the Senior Center as high a priority. She explained the Wooddale Park plan was moved down because of some of the concerns expressed by the Park Board as to how this got put so high on the priority list. In addition, they felt that a strategic plan should address some of these issues so that the Park Board has a better opportunity to make decisions.

Member Jones indicated in looking at the two books being passed around she agrees there are whole sections she thinks they could leave out especially if they only have \$60,000. She asked if there is some type of listing of normal compliments of a strategic plan, what other cities include in their strategic plans. Member Deeds replied he doesn't know for parks and recreation particularly but yes, there is a format for a strategic plan. Member Jones commented she does want to limit that because it's wasting time. Member Cella stated that they don't need to reinvent the wheel if there are 3, 4 or 5 good park plans that other cities have done and see what components are in their vision and then if they see those components, she doesn't even know that they need a consultant to help them work through that, they could maybe facilitate them working through their vision. She stated there is no consultant that is going to come in and tell them what their vision is, if they can't come up with a vision as a Park Board then they have other issues.

Member Jones noted maybe this would be a retreat issue to which Member Deeds replied that or perhaps some focus groups and other things. He explained that focus groups are tricky things and that is where you want to get somebody who actually knows what they are doing. He would see the budget going less having some consultant write a report for them then having somebody be able to do some pretty solid market research, community needs assessment, because 2006 is 6 years old. Have some focus groups and discussions and try and understand what the various segments, both demographic segments as well as geographic segments, of the community are interested in.

Chair Steel stressed to the Park Board that it is on them to bring the brainpower to the table, it's going to be a little more work than looking at specific projects. Member Deeds suggested the best thing for next meeting for him would be a thorough a comparison of our infrastructure, etc. in the parks and recreation area to Eden Prairie, Minnetonka, etc. If they have a real good assessment of what they have and what they don't, relative to what they had as a starting point. Ms. Kattreh noted that in one document that they have access to the Proragis document that they did through the National Recreation Park Association because they can put in any filters they want to compare to other communities throughout the country. He stated maybe there are some other very well-known communities that are kind of the standard of excellence that are worth benchmarking against, particularly if there are some like us that are an inner-ring burb that is older and that has done some interesting things.

Member Segreto asked at what point does the reality of our budget impact the strategic plan because she has seen a lot of plans with great visions and ideas; however, there is no money to execute them. At what point does the reality of the budget impact the planning process. Member Deeds replied you begin to prioritize and then you go back to the decision makers, in this case it's the City Council, and you are either going to go out for a bond issue or you are going out for a bond and raise 20 or 30 million dollars for parks and recreation. Member Deeds explained your first cut is to present options to the decision makers so you go through and assess where are we weak, where are we missing the boat, etc., and where are the opportunities. Then you put together plans from this is the vision here and you put together price tags on them and then you go back to the decision makers before you go any further and you dig any deeper and you waste any more time. Member Segreto asked so it's an advocacy. Member Deeds stated before you waste any more time you either get thumbs up or thumbs down because there is no sense in going down into the weeds and going down into the level of detail and pushing through on everything if there is not the budget and support to do it.

Member Gieseke informed the Park Board that the Mayor asked him if he could do anything with Fred Richard's Golf Course what would you do. Where are our strengths, where are our weaknesses, how do we compete and what would you turn that into to draw young couples and their children and keep the school system strong. Member Jones commented that brings up a really good point because they spent money on a golf consultant and were told that was not within the scope of looking at that and that we could not suggest to the golf consultant that it would not be anything other than a golf course. She stated that is the type of direction they need if they ever go into hiring out a consultant. They need to make sure they understand what is on the table as well as what can and cannot be on the table.

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board cost recovery goals for enterprise facilities did receive City Council approval and she would think that would be something they could start mid to late year as they are approaching the budgeting process and business plan process again this year.

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board regarding Garden Park baseball renovations they did not receive the large grant that they were hoping for; however, they did receive a \$25,000 grant for batting cages and they still have \$100,000 on the table from the Edina Baseball Association and \$100,000 matching from the City CIP. She will be working with that group so they will have something for the Park Board.

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board that regarding the Lake Edina pathway she thinks it is something that will not involve a ton of Park Board time although they will be hosting some public hearings on the project.

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board regarding the Countryside Master Park they are hoping to receive approval from the City Council at the end of January and will hopefully start construction on the project this spring.

Ms. Kattreh indicated to Member Segreto's point about the Senior Center she still thinks it's a really great project for them to take a look at this year just maybe hold off until the middle or second half of the year. She stated she would like to get the strategic planning process started as well as the community gardens started and thinks the middle of the year would be a good time to put together a committee to work on that. Chair Steel asked Ms. Kattreh to put together a tentative calendar knowing that the strategic planning process is going to kind of rule the schedule for the next meeting.

Member Dan Peterson informed the Park Board that it was discovered by the soccer field study group that the church on Tracy Avenue on the south side of the Crosstown is in financial trouble and if anything happens he thinks the City and Park System should buy it. Member Deeds commented that is the perfect site for the sports dome. Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board that they have had discussions with the church about the property and that the City's Economic Development Coordinator talked to the church and reported his findings to the City Council and the City Council has decided that they are not interested in pursuing that property at this time. She noted she has not been involved personally in any of the conversations but does know there are legal issues associated with the property that the city did not want to get tangled up in. Member Deeds commented that they have so little remaining undeveloped space that when something like this comes up they can't let it pass.

Member Dan Peterson indicated that he would be interested in joining other programs with other suburban park systems like Bloomington and Eden Prairie. They probably have more available land for a dirt bike path, etc., and just because it happens to be in someone else's territory doesn't mean our folks couldn't use it. It's a good way to share and reduce costs.

Member Cella commented that it states under the Other Work Plan Ideas Considered for Current Year or Future Year "Cooperative agreement with School District for use, upgrade and maintenance at Creek Valley Park athletic fields and Cornelia School Park athletic fields" and asked what the status is. Ms. Kattreh replied there really is no status update at this point but there are conversations that she thinks they need to have in 2013. They have very unusual situations at Cornelia and Creek Valley where the school is on city property and the city is on school property and added that she thinks they are probably very easy for them to work out. Member Cella indicated that when they are ready to have those conversations to talk to her because she is the Treasurer of the School Board and the chair of the Financing Facilities Subcommittee.

Member Dan Peterson asked if the golf dome should that be part of this to which Ms. Kattreh replied she was going to report on that briefly under staff comment. She informed the Park Board they are struggling with their insurance provider, they still have not received a settlement offer from them but she is hoping to have a settlement offer by the end of next week. At this point they are hopeful they will have a dome open by October but that there is going to be a significant difference between their insurance and what it's going to cost them to rebuild the dome and excess rebuilding at this point a very rough number is approximately \$800,000. Member Deeds asked does that then put them at a point of actually considering whether we rebuild a golf dome. Ms. Kattreh replied that the number could get to the point where the City Council could say we are not going to do it, it's definitely a possibility. She added they have already spent a fair amount of money on the consultants to get them to the point where they've already bid two aspects of the dome, the turf and the fabric so they have a lot invested in the program. She noted that one other thing is the fact that the dome burned down because of an electrical error of some type; however, they don't know if it was an equipment failure or

a contractor failure but there might be an opportunity for them to pursue legal action with them as well.

VII. CORRESPONDENCE AND PETITIONS

None

VIII. CHAIR AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Member Dan Peterson commented that the reason he brought up the golf dome is because two or three folks called him at home asking what is going on. He thinks it would be useful if something could be put on the City's website with updates of what is going on such as funding, the golf dome, sports dome and golf practice facilities for the summer, etc. Ms. Kattreh replied they do have the City Extra as an option where people have the ability to sign on to different components. She indicated they have not done a good job of utilizing that and it is another initiative staff will be working on.

Member Jacobson asked if the park reservations system is in place that Mr. Keprios referred to last year. Ms. Kattreh replied no, their website implementation has been much slower than they had hoped and they are still wrestling with their online registration portion of it. She noted once they get that component operational, they will be rolling into the facility registration.

Member Jones congratulated the park maintenance staff for their ice rinks and informed the Park Board there were professional hockey players, thanks to the strike, playing a pick –up game at Highlands Park.

Member Deeds would like to congratulate whoever was involved in having the good insight to hire Ms. Kattreh. Ms. Kattreh replied she appreciates that and is very excited about the opportunity and looks forward to working with the Park Board more closely and added her door is always open.

Member Deeds asked when they are reviewing the enterprise facilities will there be any opportunity for discussion about whether or not they are appropriately classifying the enterprise facilities to which Ms. Kattreh replied she thinks that is a great opportunity to have that discussion.

IX. STAFF COMMENTS

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board that regarding the Sports Dome update she has been working with the associations to gather field use data. She noted that hopefully they will be compiling that within the next month or two. In addition, she has also been working with Cunningham, Anderson and Johnson on very, very preliminary layouts for potential dome options at the Braemar athletic field site.

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board that the Naming and Donations Work Group will go before the City Council work session on January 22nd to get their feedback.

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board that the Edina Swim Club's residency requirement for their priority use of the Aquatic Center will be on the City Council's January 22nd agenda. She explained the reason they are going right to the City Council is because it was a City Council action that put this policy in place. She indicated that the Edina Swim Club is not able to achieve the 75% residency requirement so they are requesting that percentage be lowered to probably 60%. She stated that she feels very confident they will be able to achieve 70% but if not she doesn't want to have to do it again.

Member Peterson asked if there has been any word on the Veteran's project with the fundraising. Ms. Kattreh replied she believes they do have someone that is in charge of fundraising and informed the Park Board that Mr. Keprios is also staying involved on that committee. She noted they are going

strong on trying to continue to raise funds and get the project off the ground. Member Dan Peterson asked what the status is to which Ms. Kattreh replied in pledges and donations she believes they are just under \$150,000. They need a much more aggressive fundraising effort and that is what they hope to be kicking off in 2013.

Member Jones asked if there are any openings coming up for the Park Board to which Ms. Canton replied three people are up for re-election which she believes all will be returning. Member Segreto indicated that she has applied to be on the Three Rivers Park Commission and is not sure if there might be a conflict of interest of being on the Park Board and the Three Rivers Commission.

Member Jones stated that she knows other Boards and Commissions have had their attendance records available at each meeting and asked Ms. Canton if it would be possible for her to bring the Park Board attendance to their meetings. Ms. Canton replied starting next month she will do that.

Meeting adjourned at 8:35 pm.